

REMARKS

Claims 1-66 and 68 were presented for examination and claims 1-66 and 68 are rejected. In the present amendment, claims 1, 23, 45 and 68 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for the amended claims can be found at least in paragraph [0058] of the specification. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-68 will be currently pending in this application, of which claims 1, 23, 45 and 68 are independent. Applicants submit that claims 1-66 and 68 are in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

SUMMARY OF EXAMINER INTERVIEW

Applicants and his attorneys thank the Examiner for the Examiner's Interview conducted on June 30, 2008. The substance of the interview included discussing claim amendments proposed in view of the Examiner's comments in the Office Action of March 25, 2008. The Examiner suggested further clarifications to the claims which are reflected in claims 1, 23, 45 and 68, as amended.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6, 10-19, 21, 23-28, 32-42, 44-52, 56-64, 66 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Brezak et al.(US Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0018913) ("Brezak") as evidenced by Ganesan (US Patent Number 5,557,678) ("Ganesan"). Claims 7-9, 29-31 and 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable

over Brezak in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0233554 to Litai et al. (“Litai”). Claims 2-22 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1, as amended. Claims 24-44 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 23, as amended. Claims 46-66 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 45, as amended. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Brezak, Litai and Ganesan, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

A. Independent Claims 1, 23, 45 and 68 patentable over Brezak and Ganesan

Independent claim 1 is directed towards a method and independent claims 23, 45 and 68 are directed towards systems for authenticating a client to a content server. These independent claims, as amended, recite a second ticket being disabled from use and a ticket authority enabling the second ticket for use upon validation of a first ticket. The disabled second ticket cannot be validated by the ticket authority until enabled. Brezak and Ganesan, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention, as amended.

Brezak and Ganesan, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the second ticket being disabled from use and the ticket authority enabling the second ticket for use upon validation of the first ticket. The disabled second ticket cannot be validated by the ticket authority until enabled by the ticketing authority after validation of the first ticket. In the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Brezak fails to disclose each and every feature of the tickets in the claimed invention and cites Ganesan to bridge these deficiencies. However, as with Brezak, Ganesan also fails to disclose enabling a second ticket after a first ticket is validated wherein the second ticket is disabled from use and cannot be validated by the ticket authority until enabled by

the ticket authority. Ganesan describes pre-generation of session keys and storing them on a server (Ganesan, col. 8, lines 64-65) but fails to teach or suggest enabling or disabling the session keys or enabling session keys based on validation of other session keys. As with the tickets of Brezak, the generated session keys of Ganesan are not disabled for use and do not depend on the validation of another session key to be enabled for use. Thus, neither Brezak nor Ganesan teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Since Brezak and Ganesan, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest generating a second ticket before a first ticket is validated wherein the second ticket is disabled from use and cannot be validated by the ticket authority until enabled by the ticket authority, Applicants submit independent claims 1, 23, 45 and 68 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 2-6, 10-19 and 21 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Claims 24-28, 32-42 and 44 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 23. Claims 46-52, 56-64, 66 and 68 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 45. Thus, dependent claims 2-6, 10-19, 21, 24-28, 32-42, 44, 46-52, 56-64, 66 and 68 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-6, 10-19, 21, 23-28, 32-42, 44-52, 56-64, 66 and 68 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

B. Dependent Claims 7-9, 29-31 and 53-55 patentable over Brezak and Litai

Dependent claims 7-9, 29-31 and 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Brezak in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0233554 to Litai et al. ("Litai"). Claims 7-9 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of

independent claim 1. Claims 29-31 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 23. Claims 53-55 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 45. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Brezak and Litai, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element recited in the claimed invention.

The patentability of independent claims 1, 23 and 45 over Brezak and Ganesan have been argued above. The same arguments are reiterated here as if set forth in full. Further, as with Brezak and Ganesan, Litai fails to teach or suggest generating a second ticket before a first ticket is validated wherein the second ticket is disabled from use and cannot be validated by the ticket authority until enabled by the ticket authority. Therefore, Litai fails to detract from the patentability of dependent claims 7-9, 29-31 and 53-55. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 7-9, 29-31 and 53-55 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiners' rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 25, 2008

/Christopher J. McKenna/

Christopher J. McKenna
Registration No. 53,302
Attorney for Applicants

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP
Two International Place
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 248-5000 (phone)
(617) 502-5002 (fax)